REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the office action mailed on October 19, 2005. Claims 17-20 and 105-174 are pending and stand rejected. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 17-18 and 105-139 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over certain claims of copending Application No. 10/671,162 in view of Doonan (U.S. 6,807,277). Claims 19-20 and 140-174 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over certain claims of copending Application No. 10/671,162 in view of Liu (U.S. 6,760,752). These rejections are respectfully traversed because the pending claims, as amended, are not obvious in view of either Doonan or Liu, for at least the reasons set forth below. The patent owner therefore respectfully requests that the double patenting rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections

Claims 17-18 and 105-139 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AirMobile Communication Server Guide in view of Doonan. Claims 19-20, 140-146 and 148-174 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AirMobile Communication Server Guide in view of Liu. The patent owner submits that the rejected claims are patentable over the cited references, and thus traverses the instant rejections. Nonetheless, claims 17 and 19 have been amended further distinguish the claims from the cited prior art. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Among other distinctions, none of the cited references, including Doonan and Liu, teach or suggest the step of "if the new data item should be redirected, then using the redirector host system to automatically encrypt the new data item to form an encrypted new data item using a cipher algorithm and

an encryption key," as recited in independent claims 17 and 19. In the claimed methods, the encryption key is automatically applied by the redirector host system, and not by the original sender of the messages. This is significant because it ensures that unsecured electronic messages are never transmitted by the redirector over the wireless network, regardless of whether the original sender chooses to encrypt the message. Nothing in any of the cited references, either alone or in combination, suggests this claimed security feature. Rather, in the cited Doonan and Liu references, the message originator must always take affirmative steps to encrypt the message or may choose not to encrypt the message. *See, e.g.,* Doonan, col. 2, lines 1-21 ("The sender uses the encryption key to encrypt the message..."; *see also,* Liu, col. 15, line 51 - col. 16, line 10 ("Once initialized, sender 102 can compose and, [sic] send secure E-mail... When a sender 102 desires to send a secure E-mail message to a recipient 104, send process 248 is invoked by sender 102.") In the claimed methods, the message is always encrypted before it is transmitted to the mobile device, whether the original message sender chooses to encrypt the message or not.

For at least these reasons, the patent owner submits that independent claims 17 and 19 are patentably distinct from the cited references and are in condition for allowance. Claims 18, 20 and 105-174 each ultimately depend form one of claims 17 and 19 and are thus also in condition for allowance. The Examiner is, therefore, respectfully requested to enter this Amendment and pass this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY

Joseph M. Sauer (Reg. No. 47,919)
Jones Day
North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-7506